

# Federal Communications Commission

---

## Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Federal-State Joint Board on	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

### ERRATUM

**Released: April 21, 2005**

By the Acting Deputy Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau:

On March 17, 2005, the Wireline Competition Bureau released a Report and Order, FCC 05-46, in the above-captioned proceeding. This erratum corrects the following errors in the released document:

1. In the following footnote and paragraphs, change “study area” to “service area” as follows:

Footnote 134: “47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(5). Section 54.207 of the Commission’s rules, which implements section 214(e)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, provides that a rural telephone company’s service area will be its study area “unless and until the Commission and the states, after taking into account the recommendations of a Federal-State Joint Board instituted under section 410(c), establish a different definition of service area for such company.” 47 C.F.R. § 54.207(b). Among other things, the Joint Board recommended that the state commissions and the Commission consider and protect against the potential for creamskimming when contemplating a request to redefine a service area. *See Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, Recommended Decision, CC Docket No. 96-45, 12 FCC Rcd 97, 179-80 para. 172 (1996) (*1996 Recommended Decision*). In *Virginia Cellular ETC Designation Order* and *Highland Cellular ETC Designation Order*, the Commission applied to certain service area redefinition petitions the creamskimming analysis the Commission uses to decide ETC applications. *Highland Cellular ETC Designation Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 6440, para. 39; *Virginia Cellular ETC Designation Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 1578, para. 32.”

Third sentence of paragraph 73: “This process of changing the incumbent LEC’s service area — and therefore the competitive ETC’s service area — is known as the redefinition of a service area.”

Third sentence of paragraph 74: “We agree with the Joint Board that in redefining an incumbent LEC’s service area so as to conform with the service area of a new ETC, the states and Commission should continue to work in concert to decide whether a different service area definition would better serve the public interest.”

## Federal Communications Commission

---

Fourth sentence of paragraph 75: “We also reject the argument posed by certain commenters that contend that the Commission should require redefinition of all service areas for which competitive ETCs seek designation or have been designated instead of redefining service areas on a case-by-case basis.”

First sentence of paragraph 76: “The Commission has before it several petitions seeking redefinition of incumbent LEC service areas.”

Sixth sentence of paragraph 76: “These petitions seek to redefine the rural incumbent LEC service area for the same areas, including some partial wire centers, such that the ETC’s designated service area and the incumbent LEC’s redefined service area would be the same.”

2. In the fifth sentence of paragraph 90, change “filing” to “following” so that the sentence reads as follows: “For ETCs designated in areas served by rural incumbent LECs, line count data submitted on March 30 are used to target support for the third and fourth quarters of each year, line count data filed on September 30 are used to target support for the first quarter of the following year, and line count data filed on December 30 are used to target support for the second quarter of the following year.”

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Thomas A. Buckley  
Acting Deputy Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division  
Wireline Competition Bureau